arXiv:math/0212331v2 [math.PR] 19 Jun 2003

Operator semi-selfdecomposable measures and related nested subclasses of measures on vector spaces

C. R. E. Raja

Abstract

T-semi-selfdecomposability, operator selfdecomposability and subclasses $L_m(b,(T_t))$ and $\tilde{L}_m(b,(T_t))$ of measures on complete separable metric vector spaces are introduced and basic properties are proved. In particular, we show that μ is T-semi-selfdecomposable if and only if $\mu = T(\mu)\nu$ where ν is infinitely divisible and μ is operator selfdecomposable if and only if $\mu \in L_0(b,(T_t))$ for all $0 < b < 1$.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60B11, 60B12.

Key words: weak convergence, infinitesimal triangular systems, infinite divisibility, semi-selfdecomposablity and self-decomposability.

1 Introduction

Let E be a complete separable metric topological vector space. Let $\mathcal{P}(E)$ be the space of all regular Borel probability measures on E. We endow $\mathcal{P}(E)$ with the weak topology, a net (μ_i) in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ converges weakly to μ if $\mu_i(f) \to \mu(f)$ for all bounded continuous functions on E. Then $\mathcal{P}(E)$ with convolution is a complete separable metric topological semigroup. For $\mu, \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $\mu\lambda$ denotes the convolution product of μ and λ.

A triangular system $\{\lambda_{n,j} \mid n \geq 1,~ 1 \leq j \leq k_n\}$ of probability measures on E is said to be *infinitesimal* if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_j \lambda_{n,j}(E \setminus U) = 0$$

for each open neighborhood U of 0. We say that a triangular system $(\lambda_{n,j})$ converges to λ if $\prod_{j=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{n,j} \to \lambda$.

A probability measure μ on E is called *infinitely divisible* if for each $n \geq 1$, there exists a $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that

$$\mu_n^n = \mu.$$

Let $I(E)$ be the set of all infinitely divisible measures in $\mathcal{P}(E)$.

A continuous convolution semigroup (c.c.s.), (μ_t) of probability measures on E is a continuous semigroup homomorphism $t \mapsto \mu_t$ from $[0, \infty)$ into $\mathcal{P}(E)$.

A probability measure μ on E is called *embeddable* if there exists a c.c.s. (μ_t) such that $\mu_1 = \mu$. It is easy to see that embeddable measures are infinitely divisible. We will see that the converse is true if E is strongly root compact. We recall that E is said to be *strongly root compact* if for every compact set $C \subset E$ there exists a compact set $C_0 \subset E$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ all finite sequences $\{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n\}$, $x_n = 0$, satisfying the condition

$$(C + x_i + C + x_j) \cap (C + x_{i+j}) \neq \emptyset$$

for $i + j \leq n$, $i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ are contained in C_0 (see [18] and [4] for details on root compactness).

Let $\mathcal{L}(E)$ be the space of all invertible continuous linear operators on E: it may be noted that any $T \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ has continuous inverse (see 2.11 and 2.12 of [14]). For $T \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $T(\mu)$ is defined by $T(\mu)(B) = \mu(T^{-1}(B))$ for all Borel subsets B of E. A linear operator T in $\mathcal{L}(E)$ is called *contraction* if $T^n(x) \to 0$ for all $x \in E$.

We equip $\mathcal{L}(E)$ with strong operator topology, that is, a net (T_α) in $\mathcal{L}(E)$ converges (in the strong operator topology) to T or $T_\alpha \to T$ if $T_\alpha(x) \to T(x)$ for all $x \in E$. It may be noted that $\mathcal{L}(E)$ equipped with strong topology and $\mathcal{P}(E)$ with weak topology, the map $\Psi\colon \mathcal{L}(E) \times \mathcal{P}(E) \to \mathcal{P}(E)$ defined by $\Psi(T, \lambda) = T(\lambda)$ is sequentially continuous.

Definition 1 We say that a $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is *T-semi-selfdecomposable* for a contraction $T \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ if there exists a sequence (ν_i) of probability measures on E and an increasing sequence $N(n) \to \infty$ and a sequence (T_n) from $\mathcal{L}(E)$ such that $(\nu_{n,i})$ is a infinitesimal triangular system with $\prod \nu_{n,i} x_n \to \mu$ where $\nu_{n,i} = T_n(\nu_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq N(n)$, (x_n) is a sequence in E and $T_{n+1}T_n^{-1} \to T$.

This notion is a natural extension of stable and semi-stable measures. The classical situation is studied in [10], for measures on finite-dimensional vector spaces this notion was considered in [11] and [12] and in [23] such measures on locally compact abelian groups was considered with emphasis on totally disconnected groups.

Definition 2 We call a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ *T-decomposable* for a $T \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ if $T(\mu)$ is a factor of μ, that is, $\mu = T(\mu)\nu$ for a $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ (such a ν is called corresponding co-factor) and in addition if $T^n(\mu) \to \delta_0$, μ is called *strongly T-decomposable.*

The notion of T-decomposable measures on infinite-dimensional cases, mainly the Banach space situation was studied in [7], [20] and [21].

In this article we consider T-semi-selfdecomposable measures and prove that a probability measure μ is T-semi-selfdecomposable if and only if μ is (strongly) T-decomposable with an unique infinitely divisible co-factor.

We next introduce subclasses of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $I(E)$ and study their basic properties that are similar to results in section 2 of [12] (see also [8] and [9]) where the results are proved for measures on finite-dimensional vector spaces.

A one-parameter subgroup (T_t) of $\mathcal{L}(E)$ is a continuous homomorphism $t \mapsto T_t$ from $(0, \infty)$ into $\mathcal{L}(E)$. Let $\mathcal{L}_+$ be the set of all one-parameter subgroups (T_t) such that $T_t(x) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ for all $x \in E$.

Definition 3 Let $0 < b < 1$, $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ and $H \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$. A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is said to be in the class $\tilde{K}(H, b, (T_t))$ if there exist a sequence of (μ_n) in H, a sequence (a_n) of positive numbers and a subsequence (k_n) of integers such that

$$\frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \to b \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\frac{1}{a_n}}(\mu_1 \mu_2 \cdots \mu_{k_n}) x_n \to \mu$$

for some sequence (x_n) in E and in addition if the system $\{T_{\frac{1}{a_n}}(\mu_i) \mid 1 \le i \le k_n\}$ is infinitesimal, we say that $\mu \in K(H, b, (T_t))$.

It follows from the definition that $K(H, b, (T_t)) \subset \tilde{K}(H, b, (T_t))$. The class $\tilde{K}$ is studied in [2] and the class K is studied in [12] for measures on finite-dimensional vector spaces.

We now introduce other nested subclasses.

Definition 4 For $0 < b < 1$ and $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$, we define

$$L_0(b, (T_t)) = K(\mathcal{P}(E), b, (T_t)),$$

$$L_m(b,(T_t)) = K(L_{m-1}(b,(T_t)), b, (T_t)), m = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

and

$$L_\infty(b,(T_t)) = \cap_{m=1}^{\infty} L_m(b,(T_t)).$$

Similarly we define $\tilde{L}_m(b,(T_t))$ using $\tilde{K}$ instead of K.

Definition 5 For $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ and $H \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$, we define

$$K(H,[0,1],(T_t)) = \cap_{b\in[0,1]\setminus\{0,1\}} K(H,b,(T_t))$$

and

$$L_0([0,1],(T_t)) = K(\mathcal{P}(E),[0,1],(T_t))$$

and we define inductively for $1 \le m < \infty$,

$$L_m([0,1],(T_t)) = K(L_{m-1}([0,1],(T_t)),[0,1],(T_t)),$$

$$L_\infty([0,1],(T_t)) = \cap L_m([0,1],(T_t)).$$

Similarly define $\tilde{L}_m([0,1],(T_t))$ using $\tilde{K}$ instead of K for all $0 \le m \le \infty$.

Definition 6 A $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is called *operator selfdecomposable* with respect to $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}^+$ if there exist a sequence (μ_n) in $\mathcal{P}(E)$, a sequence (x_n) in E and $b_n > 0$ such that the triangular system $\{T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_i) \mid 1 \le i \le n\}$ is infinitesimal and

$$T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\prod_{j=1}^{n}\mu_j)x_n \to \mu.$$

The class of operator selfdecomposable measures was studied in [12] for measures on finite-dimensional vector spaces and in [5], [8], [9], [13] and [22] this class was considered for measures on Banach spaces. Here we prove the equivalence of operator selfdecomposable measures with other subclasses in Definition 5.

We wish to remark that the operator selfdecomposable measures are also known as Lévy's measures and the standard definition of such measures given by K. Urbanik [22] is different from the one given here. In [13] and [22], the authors considered the group of invertible operators with norm topology and in particular, the semigroup (T_t) is supposed to have bounded generator. In [8] and [9], the authors considered the group (tI) of operators. Thus, when E is a Banach space, Theorem 5 (to be proved in Section 4) and the main result in [13] and [22] show that our notion is more general than the one given in [13] and [22] provided the measure is not supported on a proper hyperplane. We also wish to mention the work of Riddhi Shah [16] which further generalizes the notion of self-decomposability for non-commutative groups.

2 Preliminaries

We first prove a technical lemma. On complete separable metric groups, it is known that point-wise contracting automorphisms are uniformly contracting on compact sets (see [19]). Using an elementary argument we extend the result to

Lemma 1 *Let* T *be a contracting operator in* $\mathcal{L}(E)$. *Suppose* Γ *is a relatively compact subset of* $\mathcal{P}(E)$. *Then* $T^n(\lambda) \to \delta_0$ *uniformly for all* $\lambda \in \Gamma$.

Proof Let U be a neighborhood of 0 in E and $\epsilon > 0$. Since Γ is relatively compact, there exists a compact set K such that $\lambda(E \setminus K) < \epsilon$ for all $\lambda \in \Gamma$. By Lemma 1 of [19], there exists a N such that $T^n(K) \subset U$ for all $n \geq N$. Now for $n \geq N$, $T^n(\lambda)(E \backslash U) \leq \lambda(E \backslash K) < \epsilon$ for all $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Thus, $T^n(\lambda) \to \delta_0$ uniformly for all λ in Γ. $\square$

The proof of the following embeddability result is more or less identical to the proofs following W. Böge as in [18].

Proposition 1 *Let* E *be strongly root compact and* $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. *Suppose* (μ_n) *is a sequence in* $\mathcal{P}(E)$ *such that* $\mu_n^{k_n} \to \mu$ *as* $k_n \to \infty$. *Then* μ *is embeddable in a c.c.s.* (μ_t).

The *linear dual* E^* of E is the space of all continuous linear functionals on E. The following result may be seen as the generalized central limit theorem on E (see Chapter 2 of [1]).

Theorem 1 *Let* $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. *Suppose* E *is strongly root compact and the linear dual of* E *separates points of* E. *Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *there exists an infinitesimal triangular system* $\{\mu_{n,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq k_n\}$ *and a sequence* (x_n) *in* E *such that* $\prod_i \mu_{n,i} x_n \to \mu$;
2. μ *is infinitely divisible;*

3. μ is embeddable in a c.c.s. (μ_t).

Remark 1 Any complete locally convex space with a countable base is a complete separable metric space which is strongly root compact (see [18]) with separating dual. Also the spaces $L^p(\Omega, \Sigma, \lambda)$ for any measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \lambda)$ and for $0 < p < 1$ are complete separable metric spaces with separating dual. It may also be proved using the arguments in [3] that the spaces $L^p(\Omega, \Sigma, \lambda)$ are strongly root compact but are not locally convex.

Proof We first show that (1) implies (2) by applying Hungarian semigroup theory of Rusza and Szekely (see [15]). Suppose μ is a limit of an infinitesimal triangular system. Since E is a complete separable metric abelian group, $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is a stable Hungarian semigroup (see [15]). We now claim that for any $\lambda \neq \delta_x$, there exists a map $f\colon F(\lambda) \to [0, \infty)$ such that $f(\lambda_1\lambda_2) = f(\lambda_1) + f(\lambda_2)$ if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2 \in F(\lambda)$ where $F(\lambda)$ is the set of factors of λ. Let λ be a non-degenerate probability measure on E. Then since the linear dual of E separates points of E, there exists a continuous linear functional ϕ such that $\phi(\lambda\check{\lambda}) \neq \delta_0$. Then there exists a real number r such that

$$0 < \int \exp(ir\phi(x)) d\lambda\check{\lambda}(x) < 1$$

and hence

$$0 < \int \exp(ir\phi(x)) d\lambda_1\check{\lambda}_1(x)$$

for any $\lambda_1 \in F(\lambda)$. Let $f\colon F(\lambda) \to [0, \infty)$ be defined by

$$f(\lambda_1) = -\log(\int \exp(ir\phi(x)) d\lambda_1\check{\lambda}_1(x))$$

for any $\lambda_1 \in F(\lambda)$. This shows that $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is a stable normable Hungarian semigroup. By Theorem 26.9 of [15] and since any element of E is infinitely divisible, μ is infinitely divisible.

Proposition 1 shows that (2) implies (3). We now prove (3) implies (1). Suppose μ is embeddable in a c.c.s. (μ_t). Then for $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\mu_{n,i} = \mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$. Then $\prod_i \mu_{n,i} = \mu$ for all $n \geq 1$. We also have $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}} \to \delta_0$. Thus, μ is a limit of an infinitesimal triangular system.

$\square$

Remark 2 (i) Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, embedding c.c.s. is uniquely determined which may be seen as follows: Let (μ_t) and (λ_t) be two continuous convolution semigroups such that $\mu_1 = \lambda_1$. Since embedding c.c.s. is unique on $\mathbb{R}$, for any $f \in E^*$, $f(\lambda_t) = f(\mu_t)$ for all $0 \leq t < \infty$ and hence $\lambda_t = \mu_t$ for any $0 < t < \infty$.

(ii) Since any point measure δ_x is infinitely divisible, hence limit of an infinitesimal triangular array, condition (1) of Theorem 1 is equivalent to

(1') there exists an infinitesimal triangular system $\{\mu_{n,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq k_n\}$ such that $\prod_i \mu_{n,i} \to \mu$ (without shift term).

3 T-semi-selfdecomposable measures

In this section we characterize T-semi-selfdecomposable measures on vector spaces. We first prove the following:

Proposition 2 *Let μ be a probability measure on a complete separable metric vector space E. Let T be a contracting operator in $\mathcal{L}(E)$ such that $\mu = T(\mu)\nu$. Suppose ν is embeddable in a c.c.s (ν_t). Then there exists a sequence (γ_i) in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and an increasing sequence $(N(n))$ of integers such that $N(n) \to \infty$ and the triangular system $\{T^n(\gamma_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq N(n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is infinitesimal and converges to μ.*

Proof Since ν is embeddable in a c.c.s. $(\nu(t))$, let $\nu_n = \nu(\frac{1}{n})$ for all $n \geq 1$. Let $N(n) = n^2$. Then for each $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq N(n)$ define

$$\gamma_i = T^{-k}\nu_{N(k)-N(k-1)}$$

if $N(k-1) < i \leq N(k)$. The assumption $\mu = T(\mu)\nu$ implies $\mu = T^n(\mu)\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k(\nu)$ for any $n \geq 1$. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T^n(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{N(n)}) & = & T^n(\prod_{k=1}^{n} \prod_{i=N(k-1)+1}^{N(k)} \gamma_i) \\ & = & T^n(\prod_{k=1}^{n} T^{-k}\nu) \\ & \to & \mu \end{array}$$

because $T^n(\mu) \to \delta_0$. We now claim that the triangular system $(T^n\gamma_i)$ is infinitesimal. Let $\Gamma = \{\nu(t) \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$. Then Γ is relatively compact.

Since T is contracting, by Lemma 1 $T^n(\lambda) \longrightarrow \delta_0$ uniformly for all $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Let U be a neighborhood of 0 in E and $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists a N_0 such that $T^n(\lambda)(E \setminus U) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N_0$ and all $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Now for $k \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$ and $n \geq 2N_0$, we have $n - k \geq N_0$ and hence

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T^n\gamma_i(E \setminus U) & = & T^{n-k}\nu_{N(k)-N(k-1)}(E \setminus U) \\ & < & \epsilon \end{array}$$

for all $n \geq 2N_0$ and all $k \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$. Since $(\nu(t))$ is a c.c.s. we have $\nu_n \longrightarrow \delta_0$. Since T is contracting, there exists a neighborhood V of 0 such that $V \subset T^{-n}(U)$ for all $n \geq 1$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a M_0 such that

$$\nu_n(E \setminus V) < \epsilon$$

for all $n \geq M_0$. Since $N(n) - N(n-1) \to \infty$, there exists a N_1 such that $N(n) - N(n-1) > M_0$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Now, for $n \geq 2N_1$ and $k \geq [\frac{n}{2}]$ we have $N(k) - N(k-1) > M_0$. Then we get that

$$\nu_{N(k)-N(k-1)}(E \setminus V) < \epsilon$$

for all $k \geq [\frac{n}{2}]$ and $n \geq 2N_1$. This implies that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T^n\gamma_i(E \setminus U) & = & T^{n-k}\nu_{N(k)-N(k-1)}(E \setminus U) \\ & \leq & \nu_{N(K)-N(k-1)}(E \setminus V) \\ & < & \epsilon \end{array}$$

for all $k \geq [\frac{n}{2}]$ and $n \geq 2N_1$. Thus, $T^n\gamma_i \longrightarrow \delta_0$ uniformly for all γ_i, that is, for every neighborhood U of 0 there exists $N > 0$ such that $T^n(\gamma_i)(E \setminus U) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$ and for all $i \geq 1$. Thus, $(T^n(\nu_i))$ is an infinitesimal triangular system converging to μ. □

We now characterize T-semi-selfdecomposable measures on E (see [11], [12] and section 3, Theorem 1 of [23]).

Theorem 2 *Let E be a complete separable metric vector space which is strongly root compact and the linear dual E^* of E separates points of E. Let μ be a probability measure on E. Let T be a contraction on E. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *μ is T-semi-selfdecomposable;*

2. *μ is (strongly) T-decomposable with an infinitely divisible co-factor.*

   In this case, the co-factors are uniquely determined.

Proof Let

$$\lambda_n = T_n(\nu_1 \cdots \nu_{N(n)})x_n,$$

$$\rho_n = T_n(\nu_1 \cdots \nu_{N(n-1)})x_{n-1}$$

and

$$\sigma_n = T_n(\nu_{N(n-1)+1} \cdots \nu_{N(n)})x_n x_{n-1}^{-1}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Since $\lambda_n \to \mu$, $\rho_n \to T(\mu)$ and hence $\lambda_n = \rho_n \sigma_n$ implies that (σ_n) is relatively compact. Thus, for any limit point ν of (σ_n), we have $\mu = T(\mu)\nu$. Since ν is the limit of a infinitesimal triangular system, by Theorem 1, ν is also infinitely divisible. Since T is contracting, any T-decomposable measure is obviously strongly T-decomposable, hence μ is strongly T-decomposable. Now for the uniqueness, let $\nu' \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ be such that $\mu = T(\mu)\nu'$. By Theorem 1 μ is infinitely divisible, hence $T(\mu)$ is also infinitely divisible. Now for any $f \in E^*$, the characteristic function of $f(T(\mu))$ does not vanish and hence $f(\nu) = f(\nu')$. Thus, $f(\nu) = f(\nu')$ for any $f \in E^*$. This implies that $\nu = \nu'$.

Conversely, suppose μ is T-decomposable with an infinitely divisible co-factor, say ν. Then by Theorem 1 ν is embeddable in a c.c.s. $(\nu(t))$. Now the result follows from Proposition 2. □

4 Nested subclasses of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $I(E)$

In this section we assume that E is a strongly root compact complete separable metric vector space and the linear dual of E separates points of E and we prove basic properties of the various subclasses defined in the introduction and their connection with operator selfdecomposable measures. We start with the following notions.

Definition 7 A subset $H \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$ is said to be (T_t)-completely closed if H is a closed subsemigroup of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $T_a\mu * \delta_x \in H$ whenever $a > 0$, $x \in E$ and $\mu \in H$. When $H \subset I(E)$, we say that H is (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense if H is (T_t)-completely closed and μ in H is embeddable in an one-parameter subgroup in H.

It is easy to see that $I(E)$ is (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense. We first consider the classes K and $\tilde{K}$.

Theorem 3 *Let $H \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$. Then we have the following:*

1. $K(H, b, (T_t)) \subset I(E)$;
2. *Suppose H is (T_t)-completely closed. If $\mu \in K(H, b, (T_t))$, then μ is (strongly) T_b-decomposable with a unique co-factor $\mu_b \in H \cap I(E)$;*
3. *Suppose H is (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense, then the converse of (2) is also true and $K(H, b, (T_t))$ is also (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense.*

Proof It follows from Theorem 1 that $K(H, b, (T_t)) \subset I(E)$. We next observe that if $\frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \to b$, then $T_{\frac{1}{a_{n+1}}}(T_{\frac{1}{a_n}})^{-1} \to T_b$. Then statement (2) and the first part of statement (3) follow from Theorem 2 and the second part of statement (3) can be easily verified. $\square$

In a similar way we may prove

Theorem 4 *Let $H \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$. Suppose H is (T_t)-completely closed. Then we have the following.*

1. *$\tilde{K}(H, b, (T_t))$ is also (T_t)-completely closed;*
2. *$\mu \in \tilde{K}(H, b, (T_t))$ if and only if μ is (strongly) T_b-decomposable with a (not necessarily unique) co-factor $\mu_b \in H$.*

It follows from Theorem 1 that $(L_m(b, (T_t)))$ are decreasing subclasses of $I(E)$. We next consider the nested subclasses (L_m) and $(\tilde{L}_m)$.

Proposition 3 *For $0 \leq m \leq \infty$, we have the following:*

1. *$\mu \in L_m(b, (T_t))$ if and only if μ is (strongly) T_b-decomposable with a unique co-factor $\rho \in L_{m-1}(b, (T_t))$ where L_{-1} and $L_{\infty-1}$ are understood as $I(E)$ and L_∞. Also, $L_m(b, (T_t))$ is (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense;*

2. *$\mu \in \tilde{L}_m(b, (T_t))$ if and only if μ is (strongly) T_b-decomposable with a (not necessarily unique) co-factor $\rho_m \in \tilde{L}_{m-1}(b, (T_t))$ where $\tilde{L}_{-1}$ and $\tilde{L}_{\infty-1}$ are understood as $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $\tilde{L}_\infty$. Also, $\tilde{L}_m(b, (T_t))$ is (T_t)-completely closed.*

Proof It may be easily seen that the first statement follows from Theorem 3 and since $I(E)$ is (T_t)-completely closed in the strong sense.

Now for the second part, since $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is completely closed, the second part for $m = 0$, follows from Theorem 4. Now the second part follows by induction on m for $1 \leq m < \infty$. For $m = \infty$, if $\mu \in \tilde{L}_\infty(b, (T_t))$, then for each $m < \infty$, there exists a $\rho_m \in \tilde{L}_m(b, (T_t))$ such that $\mu = T_b(\mu)\rho_m$. This shows that (ρ_m) is relatively compact. There exists a subsequence (k_m) such that $\rho_{k_m} \to \rho$. This implies that $\mu = T_b(\mu)\rho$. Also, since $\tilde{L}_m(b, (T_t)) \subset \tilde{L}_n(b, (T_t))$ if $n \leq m$, we get that $\rho \in \tilde{L}_m(b, (T_t))$ for all $m \geq 1$. Thus, proving the second part. □

Note that in view of Proposition 3, for $0 < b < 1$ and $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$, $\mu \in L_0(b, (T_t))$ if and only if μ is T_b-semi-selfdecomposable in the sense of Definition 1.

We next state another technical lemma which may be proved using Appendix 2 in [19] arguing as in Lemma 1.

Lemma 2 *Let $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ and Γ be a relatively compact subset of $\mathcal{P}(E)$. Then as $t \to 0$, $T_t(\lambda) \to 0$ uniformly for all $\lambda \in \Gamma$, that is for given $\epsilon > 0$ and a neighborhood U of 0 there exists a $s > 0$ such that $T_t(\lambda)(E \setminus U) < \epsilon$ for all $t < s$ and all $\lambda \in \Gamma$.*

We now obtain the equivalence between operator selfdecomposable measures and other subclasses defined in the introduction (Definition 6).

Theorem 5 *Let $(T_t) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *μ is operator selfdecomposable with respect to (T_t);*
2. *$\mu \in L_0([0, 1], (T_t))$;*
3. *$\mu \in \tilde{L}_0([0, 1], (T_t))$.*

Proof It is easy to see that (2) implies (3). We now prove (1) implies (2). Suppose μ is operator selfdecomposable. If $\mu = \delta_x$ for some $x \in E$, then (1) implies (2). So, we assume $\mu \neq \delta_x$ for any $x \in E$. Let (b_n) be a sequence of positive reals and (μ_n) be a sequence of probability measures on E such that $\{T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_i) \mid n \geq 1, \;\; 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is a infinitesimal triangular system and $T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_1\mu_2\cdots\mu_n)x_n \to \mu$ for some sequence (x_n) in E.

We first claim that $b_n \to \infty$ and $\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}} \to 1$. Suppose $b_n \not\to \infty$. Then there exists a subseqeunce $(b_{m(n)})$ of (b_n) such that $b_{m(n)} \to b < \infty$. Since $\{T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_i) \mid n \geq 1, \;\; 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is infinitesimal, $T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_i) \to \delta_0$ for all $i \geq 1$. This implies that $T_{\frac{1}{b}}(\mu_i) = \delta_0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Since $T_{\frac{1}{b}}$ is invertible, $\mu_i = \delta_0$ for all $i \geq 1$. This shows that μ itself is a dirac measure which is a contradiction. Thus, $b_n \to \infty$. For any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, let $\check{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ be defined by $\check{\nu}(B) = \nu(-B)$ for any Borel subset B of E. Now let $\mu' = \mu\check{\mu}$ and $\mu'_n = \mu_n\check{\mu}_n$ for any $n \geq 1$. Then $T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu'_1\mu'_2\cdots\mu'_n) \to \mu'$. Since $T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu_n) \to \delta_0$, we have $T_{\frac{1}{b_{n+1}}}(\mu'_1\mu'_2\cdots\mu'_n) \to \mu'$. For any $n \geq 1$, let $\rho_n = T_{\frac{1}{b_n}}(\mu'_1\mu'_2\cdots\mu'_n)$. Then $T_{\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}}}(\rho_n) \to \mu'$. Suppose $(\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}})$ is not bounded, then there exists a subsequence $k(n)$ such that $\frac{b_{k(n)}}{b_{k(n)+1}} \to \infty$. Let $a_n = \frac{b_{k(n)}}{b_{k(n)+1}}$. Then by Lemma 2, $T_{\frac{1}{a_n}}(T_{\frac{b_m}{b_{m+1}}}(\rho_m)) \to \delta_0$ uniformly for all $m \geq 1$. Let U be a neighbourhood of 0 and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a N such that $T_{\frac{1}{a_n}}(T_{\frac{b_m}{b_{m+1}}}(\rho_m))(U) > 1 - \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$ and all $m \geq 1$. Now for $n \geq N$, $T_{\frac{b_{k(n)+1}}{b_{k(n)}}}T_{\frac{b_{k(n)}}{b_{k(n)+1}}}(\rho_{k(n)})(U) > 1 - \epsilon$. This implies that $\rho_{k(n)}(U) > 1 - \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$, that is, $\rho_{k(n)} \to \delta_0$ but $\rho_n \to \mu'$. Thus, $\mu' = \delta_0$ and hence μ is a dirac measure which is a contradiction. Thus, $(\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}})$ is bounded. Suppose b is a limit point of $(\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}})$. Then since $T_{\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}}}(\rho_n) \to \mu'$ and $\rho_n \to \mu'$, we have $T_b(\mu') = \mu'$. If $b \neq 1$, then $\mu' = T_b^n(\mu') \to \delta_0$ or $\mu' = T_b^{-n}(\mu') \to \delta_0$ and therefore μ is a dirac measure. This is a contradiction and hence $b = 1$. Thus, $\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}} \to 1$.

Now for any $0 < b < 1$, there exist sequences (m_k) and (n_k) such that $m_k < n_k$ such that $\frac{b_{m_k}}{b_{n_k}} \to b$. Now for each $k \geq 1$, we have

$$T_{\frac{1}{b_{n_k}}}T_{b_{m_k}}T_{\frac{1}{b_{m_k}}}(\mu_1\cdots\mu_{m_k})x_{m_k}T_{\frac{1}{b_{n_k}}}(\mu_{m_k+1}\cdots\mu_{n_k})x_{n_k}x_{m_k}^{-1} \to \mu$$

and hence

$$\mu = T_b(\mu)\rho$$

where ρ is a limit point of $T_{\frac{1}{b_{n_k}}}(\mu_{m_k+1}\cdots\mu_{n_k})x_{n_k}x_{m_k}^{-1}$. This shows that ρ is infinitely divisible (by Theorem 1).

We now prove (3) implies (1). Suppose $\mu \in \tilde{L}([0,1],(T_t))$. Now for each $n \geq 1$, let $a_n = \frac{n}{n+1}$. Then there exists a $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $\mu = T_{a_n}(\mu)\mu_n$. Let $b_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\nu_n = T_{n+1}(\mu_n)$. Then $T_{n+1}(\mu) = T_{n+1}T_{a_n}(\mu)\nu_n = T_n(\mu)\nu_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{b_n}(\nu_1\nu_2\cdots\nu_n)T_{b_n}(\mu) &= T_{b_n}(\mu\nu_1\cdots\nu_n) \\ &= T_{b_n}(T_2(\mu)\nu_2\cdots\nu_n) \\ &= T_{b_n}(T_{n+1}(\mu)) \\ &= T_{\frac{1}{a_n}}(\mu) \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Since $\frac{n+1}{n} \to 1$ and $b_n \to 0$, we get that $T_{b_n}(\nu_1\nu_2\cdots\nu_n) \to \mu$. We now prove that $\{T_{b_n}(\nu_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq n,\ n \geq 1\}$ is an infinitesimal triangular system. Now, for $1 \leq j \leq n$, $T_{b_n}(\nu_j) = T_{\frac{j+1}{n}}(\mu_j)$. For $1 \leq j \leq \sqrt{n}$, $\frac{j+1}{n} \to 0$. Also, Since $\mu = T_{a_n}(\mu)\mu_n$ and $a_n \to 1$, we get that $\mu_n \to \delta_0$. Thus, by Lemma 2, for $\epsilon > 0$ and for a neighborhood U of 0, there exists a M_1 such that $T_{b_n}(\nu_j)(E \setminus U) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq M_1$ and all $j \leq \sqrt{n}$. Now for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\frac{j+1}{n} \leq 2$. Since $\{T_t(x) \mid 0 < t \leq 2\}$ is relatively compact, by uniform boundedness principle, $\{T_t \mid 0 < t \leq 2\}$ is equicontinuous. Let U be any neighborhood of 0 and $\epsilon > 0$. Let V be a neighborhood of 0 such that $T_t(V) \subset U$ for all $0 < t \leq 2$. Since $\mu_n \to \delta_0$, there exists a M_2 such that $\mu_n(E\backslash V) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq M_2$. This implies that $T_t(\mu_n(E\backslash U)) \leq \mu_n(E\backslash V) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq M_2$ and for all $0 < t \leq 2$. Thus, for $n \geq M_2^2$ and $\sqrt{n} \leq j \leq n$, $T_{b_n}(\nu_j)(E\backslash U) \leq T_{\frac{j+1}{n}}(\mu_j)(E\backslash U) < \epsilon$. This shows that $T_{b_n}(\nu_j) \to \delta_0$ uniformly for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, that is $\{T_{b_n}(\nu_j)\}$ is an infinitesimal triangular system. □

Remark 3 In the finite-dimensional situation, Theorem 5 was stated as Proposition 2.5 in [12] and the proof was refered to Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.4 of [17] where the result was proved for the one-parameter group (tI) of homothetical operators and to Theorem 3.3.5 of [6] where the result was proved for full measures. In view of this the proof of Proposition 2.5 in [12] is not correct. Thus, Theorem 5 corrects the proof of Proposition 2.5 of [12] and extends it to any complete separable vector space.

The following results can be proved as in Theorem 2.2 of [12] and we omit the details.

Theorem 6 *Let E, μ and (T_t) be as in Theorem 5. Then for $0 \leq m \leq \infty$,*

1. $L_m([0,1],(T_t)) = \cap_{b\in(0,1)} L_m(b,(T_t))$;

2. $\tilde{L}_m([0,1],(T_t)) = \cap_{b\in(0,1)}\tilde{L}_m(b,(T_t))$*;*

3. $L_m([0,1],(T_t)) = \tilde{L}_m([0,1],(T_t))$*.*

Acknowledgement I would like to thank the referee for his suggestions in improving the text.

References

[1] A. Araujo and E. Gine, The central limit theorem for real and Banach valued random variables, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley and Sons, New York-Chichester-Brisbane, 1980.

[2] J. Bunge, Nested classes of C-decomposable laws, Ann. Probab., 25 (1997), 215-229.

[3] T. Byczkowski and P. Graczyk, Lévy-Khinchine formula on vector spaces, Probability theory on vector spaces, IV, Lecture Notes in Math. 1391, Springer, Berlin, 1989, 23-32.

[4] H. Heyer, Probability measures on locally compact groups, A series of modern surveys in mathematics 94, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.

[5] Z. J. Jurek, Limit distributions and one-parameter groups of linear operators on Banach spaces, J. Multivariate Anal. 13 (1983), 578–604.

[6] Z. J. Jurek and J. D. Mason, Operator-Limite Distributions in Probability Theory, John Wiley (1993).

[7] W. Krakowiak, Zero-one laws for A-decomposable measures on Banach spaces, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. 33 (1985), 85-90.

[8] A. Kumar and B. M. Schreiber, Self-decomposable measures on Banach spaces, Studia Mathematica 53 (1975), 55-71.

[9] A. Kumar and B. M. Schreiber, Representation of certain infinitely divisible probability measures on Banach spaces, Journal of Multivariate Analysis 9 (1979), 288-303.

[10] M. Loève, A Course in Probability Theory, Academic Press (1974).

[11] M. Maejima and Y. Naito, Semi-selfdecomposable distributions and a new class of limit theorems, Probab. Theory Related Fields 112 (1998), 13-31.

[12] M. Maejima, K. Sato, and T. Watanabe, Operator semi-selfdecomposability, (C,Q)-decomposability and related nested classes, Tokyo J. Math. 22 (1999), 473-509.

[13] B. Mincer, The existence of one-parameter semigroups and characterizations of operator-limit distributions, Demonstratio Math. 34 (2001), 267–274.

[14] W. Rudin, Functional analysis, McGraw-Hill Series in Higher Mathematics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Desseldorf-Johannesburg, 1973.

[15] I. Z. Ruzsa and G. J. Székely, Algebraic probability theory, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, Chichester 1988.

[16] Shah, Riddhi, Selfdecomposable measures on simply connected nilpotent groups. J. Theoret. Probab. 13 (2000), 65–83.

[17] K. Sato, Class L of multivariate distributions and its subclasses, Journal of Multivariate Analysis 10 (1980), 207-232.

[18] E. Siebert, Einbettung unedlich teilbarer Wahrscheinlichkeitsmasse auf topologischen Gruppen, Z. Wahr. Verw. Gebiete 28 (1973/74), 227 - 247.

[19] E. Siebert, Semistable convolution semigroups and the topology of contraction groups, Probability measures on groups, IX (Oberwolfach, 1988), 325-343, Lecture Notes in Math., 1379, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[20] E. Siebert, Strongly operator-decomposable probability measures on separable Banach spaces, Math. Nacr. 154 (1991), 315-326.

[21] E. Siebert, Operator-decomposability of Gaussian measures on separable Banach spaces, J. Theoret. Probab. 5 (1992), 333-347.

[22] K. Urbanik, Lévy's probability measures on Banach spaces, Studia Math. 63 (1978), 283–308.

[23] K. Yasuda, On infinitely divisible distributions on locally compact abelian groups, J. Theoret. Probab. 13 (2000), 635-657.

C. Robinson Edward Raja,
Indian Statistical Institute,
Statistics and Mathematics Unit,
8th Mile Mysore Road,
R. V. College Post,
Bangalore - 560 059.
India.
creraja@isibang.ac.in